

DD/S REGISTRY

FILE

*Special file  
(Bottom drawer)*

X

25X1A

Executive Director-Comptroller

[REDACTED] HQS

Colonel White:

I briefed the substance of this memorandum  
to the Executive Committee yesterday morning  
STATINTL and I am arranging a meeting with [REDACTED]  
We will report to you after our initial consideration  
of the Director's requested action.

*SIGNED R. L. Bannerman*

R. L. Bannerman

31 AUG 1967

STATINTL Deputy Director for Support [REDACTED] 8/31/67

DD/S;RLB:maq (31 Aug 6)

Distribution:

Orig - ExDir-Compt w/O DD/S 67-4510

1 - DD/S Subject w/ccy DD/S 67-4510

DD/S 67-4510: Memodtd 30 Aug 67 for DCI fr DD/S, subj: Release of  
29 August 1967 by Senator Ervin on Senate 1035

25X1A  
Acting Director of Medical  
Services [REDACTED]

Charlie:

I briefed the Executive Committee on the substance of the attached memorandum yesterday. Also attached is an extract from the minutes of the meeting.

Please arrange to meet with me for a preliminary review of the medical forms and questionnaires currently in use.

SIGNED R. L. Bannerman

R. L. Bannerman

31 AUG 1967

STATINTE Deputy Director for Support [REDACTED]

DD/S:RLB:maq (31 Aug 67)

Distribution:

Orig - AD/MS w/ccy DD/S 67-4510 and Extract

↳ DD/S Subject w/ccy DD/S 67-4510 and Extract

DD/S 67-4510: Memo dtd 30 Aug 67 for DCI fr DD/S, subj: Release of 29 August 1967 by Senator Ervin on Senate 1035

30 August 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Morning Meeting of 30 August 1967

**E-X-T-R-A-C-T**

"DD/S reviewed Senator Ervin's press release yesterday, noting numerous inaccuracies. The Director asked the Executive Director and the DD/S to review and streamline the questionnaires currently used by the Office of Medical Services."

**E-X-T-R-A-C-T**

**s/L. K. White**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DD/567.4510

**EYES ONLY**

30 August 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Release of 29 August 1967 by Senator Ervin on Senate 1035

1. There are listed below the sections of Senator Ervin's release which represent a statement or a question as to the practices of the Agency together with the comments as to their validity.

Page 2: The first three paragraphs question whether both CIA and NSA "order their employees to go out and lobby...", "order them to go out and support organizations...", "require their employees to go out and work for the nomination or election of candidates..."

Comment: The Agency does not engage in such practices.

Page 2: The last paragraph pertaining to the evaluation of a secretary for employment.

Comment: In the Medical Form 2223 which is a part of the Personal History Statement package handed to each applicant the following questions are contained for checking and explanation:

- No. 28 - Chronic constipation
- No. 23 - Rectal trouble
- No. 34 - Difficulty of urination

This form is a qualified version of Standard Form 89 which was used throughout Government until the Spring of 1967 when it was in effect banned by the Civil Service Commission. Our Form 2223 is a modified version of the SF 89 and we continue to use it for our applicant processing.

In the Personal Index (Form 621) in Section J, "About My Health" Question No. 17 asks about "bowel trouble", "constipation",

**EYES ONLY**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100070002-1

**EYES ONLY**

<sup>2</sup>

"diarrhea", etc. Question 35 asks about kidney, bladder, urinary trouble and wetting the bed.

In Section A of the Personal Index "About My Parents" a question is asked about the parent church participation as follows: (a) Actively participate; (b) attends but not active; (c) occasionally attends; (d) rarely or never attends; (e) other.

These questions are not asked about the employee but concerning the parents for background information. Additionally, in the Personal Index a question is asked about characteristics of the mother but not directly, "If she loved her mother".

Question 32 asks whether the applicant has "unpleasant, discomforting dreams; nightmares." We do not ask the questions "if she believes in God," "if she believes in the second coming of Christ" or "if her sex life is satisfactory." In the executive annual physical examination program which relates only to staff employees, there is a form used by the Medical Office which has this question, "Sex--entirely satisfactory?"

Page 3: Question about coercion of employees to contribute to charity and buy bonds.

Comment: The Agency does not coerce its employees to contribute either to charity or the buying of bonds. We do ask the employees to check a form as to whether or not they are participating in the bond purchase program; however, we specifically tell all key-men that there is to be absolutely no pressure in the bond drive.

Page 3: The question: "Why Congress should grant these agencies the right to spend money recruiting on college campuses and strap the young applicants to machines and ask them questions about their families and personal lives."

Comment: In our applicant package of forms the applicant is informed that we expect him to take a polygraph interview which covers loyalty, background and character of the applicant. The questions listed in the Ervin statement but which we never ask in the polygraph interviews are as follows:

**EYES ONLY**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100070002-1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**EYES ONLY**

<sup>3</sup>

"When was the first time you had sexual relations with a woman?"

"How many times have you had sexual intercourse?"

"When was the first time you had intercourse with your wife?"

"Did you have intercourse with her before you were married?"

"How many times?"

We do ask the question, but in a slightly different form, "Have you ever engaged in homosexual activities?" The following question is only asked in rare and special cases when there is clear evidence that such an act has occurred: "Have you ever engaged in sexual activities with an animal?"

Page 4: The statement that the Subcommittee has received comments from a number of professors indicating concern of their faculties that their students are being subjected to such practices.

Comment: We have no evidence of any comments made by Agency applicants to the Subcommittee. We did have one case where a faculty member of a college refused to complete a polygraph interview and withdrew her application.

Page 4: In reference to the quoted letter from a Foreign Service Officer to Representative Gallagher.

Comment: We have been unable to identify this case but such a case could readily have occurred with an individual being questioned on his moral beliefs but not in the manner described in the letter. We know of no instance where the deputy chief of the polygraph unit said to a subject: "Would you prefer that we use the thumb screws?"

**EYES ONLY**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**EYES ONLY**

4

Page 6: The statement about the AFL-CIO executive council and legislation in certain states and several cities appears to be correct. We are uncertain whether the FBI made such a statement but it is quite possible they did so.

Page 6: The last paragraph in which the statement is made that the Bill limits the use of the polygraph only in certain areas and the Director may authorize its use if he thinks it necessary to protect the National Security.

Comment: Senate 1035 refers to Section 1(f) and to Section 6 which does provide the Director this authority on the basis of a personal finding with regard to each individual to be so tested.

Page 7: The question of why CIA and NSA force their employees to disclose all of their and their families' assets, etc. unless they are responsible for handling money and that the Bill has granted the agencies the exception if the Director says that the disclosure is necessary to protect the National Security.

Comment: This applies to Sections 1(l) and 1(j) and Section 6. The requirement for certain information concerning financial interests is established in E.O. 11222 dated 8 May 1965 and set forth in Agency Regulation [REDACTED]. We do ask for minor information in our PHS for credit reference purposes.

2. The above covers the pertinent statements or questions posed to the Agency.

SIGNED R. L. Bannerman

R. L. Bannerman  
Deputy Director  
for Support

cc: D/MS

DD/S:RLB:maq

Distribution:

Orig 2 - ExDir-Compt on 31 Aug 67

1 - DD/S

**EYES ONLY**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - (August 29, 1967)

OFFICE OF SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Comments by Senator Ervin; "Why the CIA and NSA Should Not be Excluded from the Provisions of S. 1035, the Bill to protect employee rights."

The Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency have asked that the guarantees in S. 1035 not be extended to their employees or to citizens who apply for employment with those agencies.

I see no practical or policy reasons for granting this request, and find no constitutional grounds for it. It is neither necessary nor reasonable.

The men who drafted the Constitution envisioned a government of laws, not of men. They meant that wherever our national boundaries should reach, and the controls established in the Constitution should apply to the actions of Government. The guarantees of the amendments hammered out in the State Constitutional Conventions and in the meetings of the First Congress had no limitations. They were meant to apply to all Americans; not to all Americans with the exception of those employed by the CIA and the NSA.

My research has revealed no language in our Constitution which envision enclaves in Washington, Langley, or Fort Meade where no law governs the rights of citizens except that of the Director of an agency. No have I found any decision of the highest court in the land to support such a proposition.

Why then do these agencies want to be exempt from this bill?

Is it that, unbeknown to Congress their mission is such that they must be able to order their employees to go out and lobby in their committees for open housing legislation or take part in Great Society poverty programs?

Must they order them to go out and support organizations, mend fences, and hand out grass seeds and then to come back and tell their supervisors what they did with their spare time and with their weekends.

Do they have occasion to require their employees to go out and work for the nomination or election of candidates for public office? Must they order them to attend meetings and fund raising dinners for political parties in the U. S.?

Do they not know how to evaluate a secretary for employment without asking her how her bowels are, if she has diarrhea, if she loved her mother, if she goes to church each week, if she believes in God, if she believes in the second coming of Christ, if her sex life is satisfactory, if she has to urinate more often than other people, what she dreams about

and many other extraneous matters?

Why do these two agencies want the license to coerce their employees to contribute to charity and buy bonds? The Subcommittee has received fearful telephone calls from employees stating that they were told their security clearances would be in jeopardy if they were not buying bonds, because it was an indication of their lack of patriotism.

Why should Congress grant these agencies the right to spend thousands of dollars to go around the country recruiting on college campuses and the right to strap young applicants to machines and ask them questions about their family, and personal lives such as:

"When was the first time you had sexual relations with a woman? ✓ *he*

"How many times have you had sexual intercourse? ✓

"Have you ever engaged in homo sexual activities? ✓ *yes*

"Have you ever engaged in sexual activities with an animal? ✓ *specific cases*

"When was the first time you had intercourse with your wife? ✓

"Did you have intercourse with her before you were married? ✓

"How many times?" ✓

What an introduction to American government for these young people!

The Subcommittee has also received comments from a number of professors indicating the concern on their faculties that their students are being subjected to such practices.

That we are losing the talent of many qualified people who would otherwise choose to serve their Government is illustrated by the following letter which was received by Representative Cornelius Gallagher, Chairman of the Special House Government Operations Committee investigations of invasion of privacy:

"I am now a Foreign Service Officer with the State Department and have been most favorably impressed with the Department's security measures.

"However, some years ago I was considered for employment by CIA and in this connection had to take a polygraph test. I have never experienced a more humiliating situation, nor one which so totally violated both the legal and moral rights of the individual. In particular, I objected to the manner in which the person administering the test posed questions, drew suggestive inferences and put my own moral beliefs up for justification. Suffice to say that after a short time I was not a "cooperative" subject, and the administrator said he couldn't make any sense from the polygraph and called in his superior, the Deputy Chief.

The Deputy Chief began in patronizing, reassuring tones to convince me that all he wanted was that I tell the truth. I then made a statement to the effect that I had gone to a Quaker school in Philadelphia, that I had been brought up at home and at school with certain moral beliefs and principles, that I had come to Washington from my university at the invitation of the CIA to apply for a position, not to have my statements of a personal and serious nature questioned not only as to their truth but by implications as to their correctness, and that I strongly objected to the way this test was being administered.

"The Deputy Chief gave me a wise smile and leaning forward said, 'Would you prefer that we use the thumb screws?' *Ag*

"I was shocked at this type of reasoning and responded that I hardly thought it was a question of either polygraph or the thumb screws.

"This incident almost ended the deep desire I had for service in the American government, but fortunately I turned to the Foreign Service. But if it had happened to me, it must have happened and did happen to hundreds of other applicants for various Federal positions."

\* \* \* \* \*

On the subject of polygraphs, the AFL-CIO in 1965 stated:

"The AFL-CIO executive council deplores the use of so-called "lie detectors" in public and private employment. We object to the use of these devices not only because their claims to reliability are dubious but because they infringe on the fundamental rights of American citizens to personal privacy. Neither the Government nor private employers should be permitted to engage in this sort of police state surveillance of the lives of individual citizens."

Legislators in five States and several cities have already outlawed these devices, and many unions have forced their elimination through collective bargaining.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has said they are unreliable for personal purposes.

Why should Congress take a step backward by specifically authorizing their continued use on American citizens in these two agencies to ask about their sex lives, their religion and their family relationships?

Bear in mind that, reprehensible as these lie detectors are, the bill only limits their use in certain areas, and the Director may still authorize their use if he thinks it necessary to protect the national security. Personally, I fear for the national security if its protection depends on the use of such devices.

Similarly the question may be asked why should these agencies force their employees to disclose all of their and their families' assets, creditors, personal and real property, unless they are responsible for handling money? Nevertheless, under the bill, the CIA and NSA have been granted the exemption they wish, to require their employees to disclose such information if the Director says it is necessary to protect the national security. What more do they want?

Apparently, what they want is to stand above the law.

Taken altogether their arguments for complete exemption suggest only one conclusion -- that they want the unmitigated right to kick Federal employees around, deny them respect for individual privacy, and the basic rights which belong to every American regardless of the mission of his agency.

The idea that any Government agency is entitled to the "total man" and to knowledge and control of all the details of his personal and community life unrelated to his employment or to law enforcement is more appropriate for totalitarian countries than for a society of free men. The basic promise of S. 1035 is that a man works for the Federal Government, sells his services, not his soul.

EO-11222  
8 May 1965  
PHB-Bradt  
Reference:  
Doc. 23-44818

25X1A

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100070002-1

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100070002-1